1895-96.
(L. R.)

File. No 90 of 95.
Serial. No. 1-7.

Sub: Appeal of Hariappa regarding the claim of Inam lands in Gundamanchanahalli Tumkur Taluk.

PF 64 of 95

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1895—96

~~192~~ .

(F R)

File No. 90 of 95

Serial Nos. 1—7

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—7

Major ~~Part~~ B for March 1896

SUBJECT. Appeal of Hariappa regarding the claim of Inam lands in Gundamachanahalli Tumkur Taluk

Endorsed

WD 223—GPB—20,000—11-6-20

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

(1)

Précis 19

Petition no 1269
dated 21st Dec: 95

Petitioner: Hariyappa
of Honnudike
Tumkur Taluk

On the 6th Augt
1885 one Shamanna
presented a petition to
the Amildar of Tumkur
that he was the Shanbhog
of Ganshamenchanhalli
and six other villages
in the Honnudike
Sanmuthy, that he
was old & no longer
able to do the Shanbhog
duties, that his sons were
minors, that until his
sons attained majority
and offered themselves
to do the duties, his Co-Shan

Post copies a
Bench circle
to the Taluk
concerned

There is
no specification
of the Inam lands
except with the
new Shrikars
will not inform
Chief by what
the extent &
appraised value
particulars
of the Inam lands
attached to each
Shrikara.

Ans'd
19/2/96

Mrs Précis
have been delayed
for more than
a month

Noted in the Telegram Book for
Inspn
20/2

Hbly
20/2

Cooked 4-5th March 96.

Hariyappa might be
directed to do the said
Shanbhogi duties, that
the (Shanbhogi of) villages
Kodihalli, Arehalli,
and Gandhamahan
-halli might be register
-ed in the name of Hari
-yappa, and the four
other villages Chikkai
Honnadike, Boochanhalli,
Anapanhalli and Lingu
pura in the name of
his (Shamanna's) minor
son Govindayya, that
out of the Sum of Rs 76¼
which was the Potgi for
the seven villages, Rs 9 should
be paid to Venkatramayya
Kurba Shanbhog and as
of the balance of Rs 67¼
Rs 42¼ should be paid
to Hariyappa and the
remainder to himself (Shamanna)

and that aplin his Sons offered themselves to do the Shanbhogi duties of the above mentioned four villages the Potgi should be enjoyed by them and Hariyappa in Equal Shares.

Shamanna & Hariyappa executed a muchalika to the amildar agreeing to abide by the above stated conditions.

14-8-'85

The following is a list showing the Survey of the Seven villages in question

Ganshamankanhalli	Rs 209 1/4
Arehalli	266 3/4
Kodihalli	436 1/2
	912 1/2
Chikka Honnadike	Rs 169 1/2
Boochanhalli	267 1/4
Anapanhalli	702 1/2
Lingapura	162
	1301 1/4
Grand Total	Rs 2213 3/4

In submitting the above petition and the Matchalika to the Dy Commr the Amildar reported that Shamanna the registered Shanbhog of the seven villages had never personally discharged the duties, that he was moreover old and ~~[illegible]~~ infirm, that Harijappa was ~~[illegible]~~ not only competent to do the duties but was also a half "kissedar" and that the arrangement proposed by Shamanna & Harijappa might be sanctioned. 15-8-85

The Deputy Commr sanctioned the arrangement proposed in the above referred memorandum. 29-8-85

On the 25th Sept 85 one Krishnappa [illegible]

...E IT OF MYSORE

presented a petition
to the Dy Commr that
he was also a hereditary
Patel of the Shanbhogi of
Ganshamachanahalli
& other villages, that
the villages should not
be divided as proposed
by Shamanna & Harijappa
and that he should be
allowed to do the Shan-
bhogi duties instead of
Harijappa -

Thereupon the Asstt
-dar reported to the Dy
Commr that petitioner
Krishnappa appeared to
be a cosharer with
Shamanna that if he
wanted to recover his
share he might recover
it from Shamanna, and
that the complaint of
Krishnappa could not
in his (Asstdars) opinion
affect Harijappa in

11-12-85

whose name some of
the villages in question
had been registered at
the request of Shemanna
the registered shanbhog.

The Deputy Commr
ordered that all the
parties concerned should
be directed to appear
before him. 24-4-86

Notices were accordingly
issued and ~~were served~~ 17-5-86
served on the parties. 24-5-86

On the 24th Augt 1886
the Deputy Commr
ordered that Hariyappa
should continue doing
the duties as before and
that all the parties should
appear at the jamabandi time.

The parties do not
seem to have appeared
before the Deputy Commr
as required until after
Feb. 1888.

The Deputy Comm^r ~~appears to have~~ also made a reference to Gov^t in the matter on the 30th March 1889.

The Gov^t thereupon ordered in their Prop^g no. 4222/137 dated 26th Aug^t 1889 as follows:-

"The Gov^t have nothing to do with the internal arrangements made by Shanbhag Shamanna and his Hissedar Hariappa regarding the division of the Emoluments between themselves, but if the register holder Shamanna has no objection to the division of the charge as proposed by the Deputy Comm^r it may be carried out on the understanding that should any dispute hereafter rise in regard to the division of the

@ vide Tamil copy of Prop^g in which the Dy Comm^r's letter is also quoted.

Emoluments the Govt will not Enforce their private arrangements but allow the registered holder of each range to draw only the Emoluments derived from the villages in his charge. If Shamanna does not consent to this arrangement all the seven villages should be registered in the names of Shamanna's son and Hariyappa jointly and Each of them will receive a moiety of the remunera-tion and be jointly respon-sible for the transaction of business in all the villages. The objection raised by Krishnappa the brother's son of Shamanna is inadmissible."

× ×

On the 5th September 1889 the Deputy Comr directed the Amildar to give effect to the above order.

On the 27th June 1890
Shamanna appears
before the Amildar &
states that he could
not abide by the Govt
order No 4222/137 of 26-8-89
(quoted above) and that his sons who
had attained majority
should be consulted in
the matter.

On the 29th July
1890 the Amildar issues
notices to Shamanna
& Hariyappa asking
them to appear before
him and state what
they had to say in the
matter of giving effect to
the Govt order regarding
the division of the Sham
-bhogi villages and their
Potgi between ~~them~~
them (Shamanna & Hari
the notices were served
on them. They do not
seem to have appear

before the amildar as
required.

In May 1893 Hariy
appa and one Venkat
-ramayya presented a
petition to the amildar
praying that the Inam
lands in Ganshamachan
-halli, Anapanhalli
and Chikka Honnudike
whose produce Shamanna
had objected to share with
them might be registered
in their names.
A notice was issued to
Shamanna to appear
before the amildar:
Shamanna appeared
and States before the
amildar that the
Shanbhogi Inam lands
in the above mentioned
three villages had been for 24
years past in his Enjoy
-ment, and that he
was not prepared to give
to Hariyappa or Venkatramayya

1-8-93

any share.

The amildar then directed the Record keeper to bring up the records connected with the Shanbhoji appointment of Hariyappa & Venkatamma.

4-8-93 The record keeper reported to the Amildar that it would appear from the Records that though the notices issued to Shamanna & Hariyappa on 29-7-90 had been served on them, they had failed to appear and give their statements as required therein.

4-8-93 The Amildar thereupon ordered that as Shamanna & Hariyappa had failed to appear & give their statements as required regarding the division of the Shanbhoji villages and the Potgi referred to in the Govt order ~~absolutely forbidden~~ to all the Shanbhoji Inam lands should be

registered jointly in the
names of Hariyappa
and Shamanna -

Shamanna there
upon preferred a
miscellaneous appeal 15-4-93
to the Dy Comm^r. against
the above order.

The Dy Comm^r. however
declined to interfere
as the matter had been
already decided by Govt
and directed that the
Govt order No. G222 of 24-8-89
137
should be given effect
to.

On the 22^d September
1894 Shamanna present
ed a petition to the amil
dar stating that he had
no objection to abide by
the above referred Govt
order, that the villages of
Ganshamachanhalli &c
halli & Kodihalli might
be registered in the name
of Hariyappa and the four
other villages Boovehanhalli

(7)

Chikka Hannadke Anapanhalli and Linga pura in the name of ~~Govindayya~~ his Shamanna's Son Govindayya, that from 1894-95 Each of them should do the Shanbhoji duties of his own Pirka and enjoy the emoluments, that the accounts of the above mentioned group of four villages which were in charge of Hariyappa should be caused to be handed over to Govindayya.

On the following day Hariyappa appeared before the amildar and agreed to abide by the above arangement.

In submitting the above petition and the statement to the Dy Comm^r. the amildar reported that the above named Govindayya was Shamanna's Son by his Second wife, that Seenappa

20-10-94

Shamanna's son by the
first wife, had, on account
of some frauds committed
by him in respect of
certain stamps whilst
he was Deputy Munshi
in the Talak office been
been convicted. ~~and~~
~~solicited the Deputy Comm~~
the writer solicited
Deputy Comm's orders
as to who should under
the above circumstances
be registered as Shanbhog.

On 25-10-94 the
Deputy Comm ordered
that as per Govt order
Hariyappa & Shamanna
might be registered as
Shanbhogs and that
after the registy was made
in the name of Shamanna
he (Shamanna) might do the needful
to get the office transferred
to in the name of his son.

On the 10th Nov 94

Shamanna presented a petition to the Deputy Comm^r praying that the office might be registered in the name of his Son Govindayya who was competent to do the duties.

On the 11^th Nov^r 1894 the Deputy Comm^r ordered that if the office had been registered in the name of Shamanna there could be no objection to it's being registered at his request in the name of his Son.

6^th Dec^r 1894

The Amildar having again solicited orders in the matter the Dy Comm^r ordered that the request of Shamanna the registered Shanbhog might be complied with.

On the 16^th January 1895 Shamanna presented a petition to the Amildar that for 24 years past he had uninterruptedly been in Enjoyment

of the Shanbhogi Inam
lands, that the Amildar
appeared to have ordered
the registry of the Shanbhogi
Inam lands in the names
of both the Shanbhogs
- Govindayya & Hariyappa -
that Hariyappa was not
entitled to have the Shan
-bhogi Inam lands registe
-red in his name, that accordingly
para ⊗ 28 of late Chf Comm's
notifn no. 219 dated 27th
October 1874 the Officiating
Shanbhog would not be
entitled to have such
Service Inam lands registe
-red in his name and that
the notifn of 1892 also
distinctly laid down that
such lands shall be
registered in the name of
the person actually in
enjoyment of the same.

On the 16th Jany 1895
the Amildar gave Shamanna

⊗ vide Para XXVIII
of the notifn put up
with file.

an Endorsement in reply that the Shanbhogi Inam lands should be registered in the name of the registered Shanbhog of the village, that although under Govt. order no ⊗ 950-60 dated 16-9-85 the Shanbhogi Inam lands were fully assessed, it would appear from Govt. Prop no. 6978-88 dated 20-6-92 that the Essential nature of such lands would not be affected by a levy of full assessment thereon, and that under these circumstances the Shanbhogi jodi lands ~~of~~ in village of which Hariyappa was Shanbhog should be registered in his name only and that no orders had however been passed regarding the possession & Enjoyment of the said lands

⊗ vide notification put up with file.

Shamanna then complain-
-ed to the Dy Comm^r that
the Inam lands which
had long been in his Enjoy
-ment had been ordered
to be registered in the name
of Hanjappa -

15-2-95

The Deputy Comm^r
ordered the Amildar
to report fully why the
Patta was altered.

19-2-95

The Amildar reports
that as the Shanbhogi
of Kodihalli, Ganesha
-nachanhalli & Arehalli
had been ordered to be
registered in the name
of Hanjappa the ~~Shanbhogi~~
Shanbhogi Inam lands
in those villages were register
-ed in the name of the said
Hanjappa.

On the 4^th April 1895
the Dy Comm^r ordered
that as it was laid down
in para 28 of Govt notifn
No 219 of 27-10-1874

that the Enjoyment of the Shanbhogi Inam lands by the Shareholders (hissedars) should not be interfered with it should not therefore be disturbed

Hariyappa having again complained to the Dy Commr. he was referred to the above order dated 4th April 1895

No 306 of 22-8-95

The present appeal to Govt is against the above order.

21-9-95

The following are the chief grounds of appeal:-

1 That para 28 of Govt notifn no 219 dated 27-10-74 ~~does not apply~~ referred to by the Deputy Commr does not apply to the present case as it applies to the Enjoyment of Inam lands by Cosharers

2 That Paras 19-20 of the above notifn distinctly lay down that the Shanbhogi Inam lands are

the primary source of remuneration to the Shanbhag. The Deputy Commr appears to have lost ~~sight~~ sight of this point.

3 That according to the principle on which the Firkas were divided in 1884 the Inam lands appertaining to the Shanbhogi office of Gaudha Inamkanahalli Firka belong to the appellant.

The appellant prays that the Deputy Commr's order may be set aside and the Shanbhogi Inam lands of his Firka ordered to be registered in his name.

The Dy Commr's report is in the file

Vdlu
M.2

The Dy Com's orders
quite correct. Under
of Govt under which the
Patelling up of these villages
was sanctioned ~~as~~ authorized
the Collr where only the
emoluments of the villages
which are confined only
to the Patel allowance -
The land cannot be taken
away from the person in
whose occupation it is.
This appeal is dismissed -

5/3/56

Petition No 1269 of 95-96.

Petitioner

Hariyappa

Counter Petitioners

1. Shamanna
2. Govindaiya
3. Venkataramaiya

Dispute regarding the Patta of certain Inam lands attached to the Shambhogi of Gandhamachanhalli & other villages in the Tumkur Taluk.

List of English papers.

(1) Potiji Rules.
(2) Govt Procs No $\frac{4222}{137}$ dt 24.8.89
(3) Do. " $\frac{3749-57}{Ai\ 53}$ dt 13.5.92
(3) Do " $\frac{13439-47}{R.1668}$ dt 28.1.93
(4) Do " 322-93 dt 7.7.94
(5) Appeal petn
(6) Office Memo.
(8) Dy Comm's report
(9) Proceedings
(10) Docket of D.C. Tumkur
(11) Deputy Comm's reply.

1895

61

C No. 8. 2 / 1269 (11)

Name of Petitioner, Shanbogue Hariappa of Gandhamachanahalli

Village, Honnadike

Taluk, Tumkur Taluk.

District, Do.

Date of Arzi, 21. 9. 95

Date of Receipt, 22. 9. 95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, one.

ABSTRACT.

Appeals against the D.C.'s order No. 306 dated 22.8.95 Communicated to the appellant thro' the Tumkur Taluk Amildar's Endt. No. 525 dated 6.9.95, regarding the appellant's Claim to the Shanbogi Inam lands of Gandhamachanahalli and other villages, Tumkur Taluk, & states that

1. That the Shanbogi of Gandhamachanahalli Firka was held by the appellant's brother Gunnu Rao who on getting another appointment put the Shanbogi in the possession of the half hissedar Shamanna Shamanna being incompetent to look after the duties got

Letters relating to Head Quarters to be called as to Court, Circulation and ... 24-9-95.

Rec'd 26/9.

Note of Board to me 26/9

Please put up the Proceedings.

9/10.

A spare copy of the Proceedings quoted within is put up. Notification copy may be taken from the Gazette.

9/10/95

Council Case
In time
Stamp sufficient.
Subd for orders, with a copy of Govt. No. 4222/137 dated 24th Augt 1889, and a copy of the Bhagi Rules.

11/10

Noted by Councillor

15-10-95

Read 18/10

Call for record
Sd illegible

Record received 22/10/95

23/10/95

23/10

Drafted
24-10-95

he had held and claimed his half share in the Shanbogi, the Taika was divided between the appellant and the said Shamanna the former getting Gandamachanhalli & two other villages while the latter Honnadike and 3 other villages. The latter was registered in the name of Sannanna an Govinda who was a minor; and in consequence, the appellant was ordered to do the duties of all the villages till the minor became fit to assume charge of his Taika, This arrangement was made under Govt. Order No: 4222/173 dated 24th Augt 1889. The appellant accordingly performed the duties of all the villages & gave share in the emoluments of the Office to Shamanna till the end of the year 1893.

4. In September 1894 the appellant handed over to Shamanna, the Shanbogi charge of the latter's Taika

The Amildar transferred to the name of the appellant the patta of the Shanbogi Inam lands of Gandhamachanhalli from that of Sannanna in accordance with Govt. Circ. on the subject.

The above Govt. order No: 4222 quoted above lays down that the emoluments of the each of the two Taikas should be enjoyed respectively by the two hereditary Registrars. Under this order the said Sannanna was giving the appellant his share of the emoluments altho' the Inam lands attached to the appellant's Taika and now in dispute were in the possession of the said Shamanna. The Dy. Commr. however has decided that these Inam lands were not included in the emoluments of the Office whereas the para 28 of Instn. No. 219 dated 27.10.74 referred to by him does not relate to this case.

This order is intended to prevent the dispossession of the Joodi lands enjoyed by the Sub-Shares in the Shanbogueship.

Govt. Order No. 4222 quoted above plainly gives each share the emoluments of his Taika & the para 1, 19, & 20 of the Ch. Commrs Instn. dated 27.10.74 which makes the Inam lands the source of primary ... to the Shanbogue has

escaped the Dy. Comms attention.

9. During the distribution of Shanbogue Fikas which took place in the year 1884, it was decided that one the holder of one Fika has nothing to do with the emoluments of another Fika & the Inam lands in question appertaining to the Gangharaya Channahalli Fika, accordingly belong to the appellant only.

The appellant prays that all the records referred to above may be perused and the Dy. Comms order appealed against may be set aside & the Amildars order restored and orders issued that the patta of the lands in dispute be made in the appellants name.

Order appealed against:- No. 525 d. 10.9.95

Endorsement No. 2594 dated 26.4.95 has been granted to you in terms of the Dy. Comms order No. 1118 dated 4.4.95 passed on the appeal preferred by Shamanna against the Amildars order that the patta of the Inam lands belonging to the Shanbogi of Gangamachanahalli should be rejected made in your name. On your appeal against the said order, Dy. Comms order No. 306 dated 22.8.95 has been received to the effect that the paras 1, 19 & 20 of Notn. No. 219 dated 27th Oct. 1874 are ~~[illegible]~~ the instructions to be observed in calculating the Potige to be fixed and do not relate to the circumstances of the present case, and that the order No. 1118 dated 4.4.95 should be communicated to you in writing. The said order states that under para 28 of Notn. No. 219 d. 27.10.74, the Shanbogi

Inam lands ~~Kaacha~~ have ~~no~~ nothing to do
with the emoluments of the Office or the Officiators
& that the Officiators
only to the Salaries fixed, & that the said Inam
lands in question should continue in the
possession of the hissadar in whose enjoyment
they had remained hitherto, & that no change
can now be made, & that they should ~~continue~~ remain
as they have been

dated 6.9.95

(sd) B. Ramaswamiah
Amildar

JWR.

Pet 841 / Dmfb 29/10/95

14

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

(2)

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition No. 1269 dated 21-9-95 received at the Dewan's Office from Shanbhog Hariappa of Gandhamachanahalli residing in Honnadike village, Tumkur Tk, appellee, against the order of Commissioner regarding his claim to the Shanbhogi Inam lands of Gandhamachanahalli & other villages, Tumkur Tk, is forwarded, together with its one enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Tumkur District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

C2

By order,

Dfc. 25-10-95

Revenue Secretary.

24-10-95
BANGALORE,

25-10-1895

25/10

29.

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000

15

Gen. 31.]



1895

(3)

18

From

Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur district.

To

The Revenue Secretary
to the Govt. of Mysore.

Dated 18th December 1895.

Despatched 19th —do—

Received

General No. 523
No.

Enclosure No. 1 V. file.

His official Memorandum
No. Pet 841. dated 25th October 1895.

Reports on the petition of
Shanbhog Hariappa of
Gandhamachanahally
in the Tumkur Taluk

Rejn
31
25/12/95

Sent with refce to the order on Petn
27/12/95

6/1

Thereadvocates
vide letter all
the facts. I
want a precis
MMS
7.1.96

Precis
for allocation
6-1-96

LR 90-95

Returned with precis to the
2nd Councillor-
18/2/96

No 523
Rec: 1V. file

Tumkur District
Deputy Commissioner's Office
Tumkur 18th December 1895.

To.

The Revenue Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your official Memorandum No: $\frac{Pet}{841}$ dated the 25th October 1895 forwarding for report with proceedings petition of Shanbhog Hariappa of Gandhamachanahally in the Tumkur Taluk appealing against this office order declining to order the registry in his name of some Service Inams, I have the honor to State as follows: —

2. On the 4th August 1885 one Shamanna registered Shanbhog of Gandhamachanahally and 6 other Villages in the Honnudike Hobli of the Tumkur Taluk presented a petition to the Amildar of the Tumkur Taluk praying that as he was too infirm by old age to perform the duties thereof, his Shanbhogy charge might be sub-

- divided

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Sub-divided into two ranges, namely, one range consisting of Gandhamacha-nahally, Arehally and Kodihally to be registered in the name of a half "hissedar" Hariappa (present peti-tioner) and the other comprising the remaining villages of Chikka Honnu-dike, Boochanahally, Annappana-hally and Lingapura to be registered in the name of his second wife's eldest son, a minor Govindappa; that the work of both the ranges might be allowed to be carried on by the former till the minor attained his Majority and became capable of performing his duties and that out of the available potigi allowance of Rs 67-4-0, Rupees 25/- might be given to him or his Sons and the balance to Hariappa. After enquiry, the case was submitted to Government

Government for orders in respect of the arrangements proposed by Shamanna. The Government in their Proceedings No: 4222/137 dated 30th March 1889 observing that the Government had nothing to do with the internal arrangements in regard to the division of the emoluments of the Shanbhogy, offered no objection to the proposed Sub-division of the charge.

3. When effect was given to this order in 1894-95, Petitioner Hariappa prayed for the registry in his name of the Shanbhogy Service Inams situated in the villages included in his charge and the Amildar of Tumkur recommended the registry as prayed for. Thereupon Mr. Venkatavaradeengar passed an order on 4th April 1895, to the effect that as per Rule 28 of Government

Government Notification No: 219 of the 27th October 1874, the Service land formed no part of the remuneration of the officiater and should therefore continue to remain in the possession of the Sharer Shanauna who held it. Against this order Petitioner now appeals.

4. The Appeal petition with its enclosures and the connected records are herewith Submitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

Mirasadar Rao

Offg: Deputy Commr:
Tumkur.

E/-

๑

๑

๗

Mysore
22-9-95

Chamarajapuram
Revenue department

22/9/95

MYSORE DE VANIS ASSOCIATION
RECD. No. 269R
DATE 26-9-95

From Govt

To The Deputy Commr
Tumkur District.

Dated 23?
Despatched 24 Feby/96
Received

General No. 7568
P. No. 1578

Enclosure No. Nil.

His letter No 523 dated 18th December 1895, reporting on the petition of Hariyappa of Gandhamachanhalli in the Tumkur Taluk.

With reference to the above has the honour to request that a statement showing the extent, assessment and other particulars of the Inam lands attached to the Shanbhogi of each of the two new Firkas formed by the division of the old Gandha-

Machanahalli Tirka, may be forwarded to this office as early as practicable, as the appeal preferred by Hanif appellants posted to 5th March 96.

By Order

Draft

HCh
23/2

For Secretary

S.V.
24/2

BR 24/2

2.3.96

2/3/96

Gen. 31.]

189 6 Pet 559.



(5)

From Deputy Commissioner Tiptur District

Re 90-95

To Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore Gel and Rev: Department

Dated 29. February 1896.

Despatched

Received

General No.

No. 708

Enclosure No. /

/His Docket No. 7568 & 1578 of 24 instant.

Submits a statement showing the extent and assessment of the Inam lands attached to the Shanbogui of the old Gandhamachanahalli Kaval Tiptur Taluk.

No 708
1

Tiptur District.
Deputy Commissioner's Office.
Tiptur 29th February
1896.

To

The Secretary to the Govern-
-ment of Mysore. General and
Revenue Departments.

Sir,

As called for in your Docket No 7568/Pet 1578 of 24th instant, I have the honor to submit herewith a statement showing the extent and assessment of the Inam lands attached to the Shanbogui of each of the two new Pirkas formed by the division of the old Gandhamanahalli Pirka, Tiptur Taluk.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant

M Narain Rao
Offg: Deputy Commissioner

Statement shewing the particulars of [illegible]
of Gundhamachenahalli and 6 other Villages of the Hommidiké Sammath in the Tumkur Taluk,
for the year Manmatha 1895–96.

Taluk	Hobli	Village.	Name of Shanbogue	Survey No:	Particulars of Service Inam lands															
					Dry					Wet					Garden					
					Extent		Assessment			Extent		Assessment			Extent		Assessment			
					A.	G.	Rs:	As	P.	A.	G.	Rs:	As	P.	A.	G.	Rs:	As	P.	
Tumkur	Hommidiké	1 Anapanahalli	Govindiah son of Shamanna	44	1	15	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		2 Búchanahalli		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		3 Linga pura.	~~Not registered~~ ~~Shanbogue~~ ~~of Tiptur~~	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		4 Chikka Hommi=dikè		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
		5 Gundhamachanahalli.	Harijaya	2	5	39	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	39	4
		6. Arékalli		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		7. Kodihalli		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
		Totals			7	14	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	14	5

Tumkur District
Deputy Commissioner's Office
Tumkur 29th February 1896.

Asst: Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

(7)

96

Read:-

Petition No. 1269 dated 21st September 1895 from Harigappa of Honnadike, appealing against the order dated 4th April 1895 passed by the Deputy Commissioner of Tumkur, declining to order the registry of the Shanbogi Inam lands of Gundamarchanhalli Torka in the Tumkur Taluk in the name of the petitioner

(2) Letter No. 523 dated 18th December 1895 from the Deputy Commr. Tumkur, reporting on the above petition and the records therewith received

Rep. 15/6

Facts of the case

1. Kodihalli
2. Arehalli
3. Gundamachanhalli
4. Chick Honnadike
5. Buchenhalli
6. Anapanhalli
7. Lingapura.

The seven villages noted in the margin situated in the Tumkur Taluk, originally constituted a single Torka, of which one Shamanna was the Shanbhog. In 1885, he and the petitioner Harigappa, a hissedar in the Inam, entered into an agreement, under which it was proposed that the Torka

should be divided into two
circles, one consisting of
the first three villages
to be registered in the name
of Hariappa, and the other
consisting of the other
villages in the name of
Shamanna's son Govindia,
and that the Potiji of all the
seven villages should be
distributed in the manner
specified therein. The
Government in Progs No $\frac{4222}{137}$
dated 24th August 1889
observed that if the
registered holders Shamanna
had no objection to the
division of the charge as
proposed, it might be
carried out on the under-
standing that should any
dispute thereafter arise
regarding the division of
the emoluments, the Govt
would not enforce these
private arrangements
but allow the registered
holder of each circle

to draw only the emoluments derived from the villages in his charge. Effect was given to this order in October 1894.

2. There were two Service Inam lands attached to the original Firka, one measuring 5 acres 39 guntas situated at Gandhamanchalli now in the Petitioner's circle and the other measuring ac: g: 1-15 situated at Anachanhalli in Govindria's circle. The petitioner prayed that the land situated in his circle might be registered in his name, but Shamanna urged that the lands had been in his possession and enjoyment for more than 24 years and that the division of the Firka did not affect his possession. The Deputy Commr. ordered that the lands should continue in the possession of Shamanna. Hence this appeal by petitioner

petitioner Kariappa

8625-
P.J. No 64-95. 97 19-3-96
Ex: one Ver. file

Order thereon

The Deputy Commissioner's order is quite correct. The orders of Government under which the splitting up of these villages was sanctioned authorized the petitioner to receive only the emoluments of the villages, which, (emoluments) are confined only to the Potigi allowance.

2. The land cannot be taken away from the person in whose enjoyment it is.

3. This appeal is dismissed.

Redraft
C2&3

19-3-96
Secretary

Do 19/3

The Deputy Commr Dumkur
Dis[t] with the records

L.V.

21-3-96

నంబరు 1269 పై (6)

ఈ చుండి దివాళాకోరు చోరియుండ

రైవాకాలు అంతరాల్యాలో
ఉన్నవి తిరిగివాళ్ళిందవ ఉంటాయి
ప్రభుత్వం రాయ్యాలు.

రాల్యాలో వాటాలు
గుంద్రవాంఛనయుళ్ళకి రంగీకారం
బంద్రవప్పే శాసనబ్యాంకు నిరో. ఇట్లా
వాటాలు అమ్మినా ఉప్పే వి బాంధుల్ని
రైవాకాలు అంతరిస్తే రాష్ట్ర తీర్పుబోవి
రేమిటీనరవాలు వాంతీద 1969
నాటికి వివిధాలలో ఉన్న వాటాలను
ఉంచుకున్నవాళ్ళలో ~~వీళ్ళు~~ ఇతరులకు
~~అంటే అంటే~~ 1969 నాటికి సోషలిజం లో 21 నాటి
అమ్మినవాళ్ళు అందరికీ
బంద్రవప్పే వాళ్ళు ఏం రాంగారం
బంధువులు దవ్వు.

ఈ వాటాలు అమ్మిన తీర్పులో
వి రేమిటీనరవాలు వాంతీదకు
రైవాకాలు ఇవ్వలేదు. గుంద్రవాం
ఇనయుళ్ళ వాళ్ళ రంగీకారం లేకుండా
వాళ్ళకు ~~వ్యతిరేకంగా~~ వ్యతిరేకంగా తీర్పు
నిరో ఇవ్వడాన్ని ఎలా అర్థం చేసుకోవాలి
ఈ ప్రశ్నలకు 1969 నాటికి వాటాలు
~~ఉన్న~~ ఉన్నవాళ్ళు ~~వాటాలు~~ ~~అమ్మినవాళ్ళు~~
~~ఉన్నవాళ్ళు~~ ~~అమ్మినవాళ్ళ